DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 316 093 HE 023 206

AUTHOR Coulter, Sara; Hedges, Elaine
TITLE Integrating the Scholarship on Women: Transforming the Curriculum.
INSTITUTION American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.; Towson State Univ., MD.
SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 88
GRANT 116-AH-30780
NOTE 35p.; This report is one of a group gatherted by the AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Projejct, funded by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, in collaboration with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. For related documents, see HE 023 199-261.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Art; Biology; Business Administration; *College Curriculum; College Instruction; *Curriculum Development; Education; English; Higher Education; History; Intercollegiate Cooperation; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Introductory Courses; Models; Program Descriptions; Psychology; Sociology; State Universities; *Womens Studies
IDENTIFIERS *AASCU ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project; Integrating the Scholarship on Women; *Towson State University MD

ABSTRACT

Townson State University's 3-year project integrated new scholarship on women into the curriculum, with emphasis on introductory survey courses in eight disciplines: art, biology, business, education, English, history, psychology, and sociology. About 70 faculty met in workshops for five semesters to (1) read and discuss new scholarship on women; (2) evaluate current syllabi and create new syllabi incorporating the new scholarship; and (3) prepare to teach the new syllabi in their classes. Workshop activity was supplemented by three conferences on integrating the new scholarship on women into the curriculum, on interdisciplinary study, and on pedagogy. The project concluded with an area conference to disseminate its results to neighboring institutions. Other products of the project include a 140-page booklet entitled "Resources for Curriculum Change" and six issues of a newsletter describing the processes and outcomes of the project. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

INTEGRATING THE SCHOLARSHIP ON WOMEN

TRANSFORMING THE CURRICULUM

PROJECT DIRECTORS: ELAINE HEDGES, SARA COULTER
TOWSON STATE UNIVERSITY • TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204 • (301) 321-2660

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
E. Edges
Towson State Univ
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED316093

"Integrating the Scholarship on Women: Transforming the Curriculum" is a three-year grant funded project to integrate the scholarship on women into lower-level survey courses in thirteen disciplines. The project provides eleven workshops of five semesters' duration, in which seventy-seven faculty will (1) read and analyze both the theory and content of the new scholarship, (2) revise courses in light of this new theory and content, and (3) teach the revised courses while they are tested and evaluated. Several conferences will reinforce and extend these activities. A conference on pedagogy will explore the actual classroom dynamics of teaching the new material, while a conference on interdisciplinary study will relate the work of the separate disciplines to each other and develop the cross-disciplinary connections necessary for genuine curriculum change. The project will conclude with an Area Conference for secondary schools, colleges, and universities in the Baltimore area in order to communicate its results and begin working with those schools for curricular reform. A newsletter, RE-VISIONS, published twice a year provides an on-going review of the activities of the project.

ELEVEN WORKSHOPS

- American History
- American Literature
- Art
- Biology
- Business
- Composition
- Education
- English Literature
- Professional Writing
- Psychology
- Sociology

FIVE SEMESTERS

- Semester I } Theory and Content
- Semester II }
- Semester III — Course Revision
- Semester IV } Teaching and Evaluation
- Semester V }

FOUR CONFERENCES

- Integrating the Scholarship on Women
- Interdisciplinary Relationships
- Classroom Dynamics
- Area Conference

HE 023 206

SUPPORTED BY FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project

The AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory is a two-year project seeking to establish and test a model system for collecting and disseminating information on model programs at AASCU-member institutions--375 of the public four-year colleges and universities in the United States.

The four objectives of the project are:

- To increase the information on model programs available to all institutions through the ERIC system
- To encourage the use of the ERIC system by AASCU institutions
- To improve AASCU's ability to know about, and share information on, activities at member institutions, and
- To test a model for collaboration with ERIC that other national organizations might adopt.

The AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project is funded with a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, in collaboration with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education at The George Washington University.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Cover Sheet

Grantee Organization:

Towson State University
Women's Studies Program
Towson, MD 21204

Grant No.:

116-AH-30780

Project Dates:

Starting Date: July 1983
Ending Date: July 1986
Dissemination Grant from
August 1986 to December 1987
Number of months: 36 plus 15

Project Directors:

Sara Coulter
Elaine Hedges
English and Women's Studies
Towson State University
Towson, MD 21204
Telephone: (301) 321-2859, 2860, 2660

Fund Program Officer:

Lynn DeMeester

Grant Award:

Year 1	$ 93,287
Year 2	93,919
Year 3	64,607
Dissemination	7,960

Summary

Towson State University's project, "Transforming the Curriculum, Integrating the Scholarship on Women" was a three-year project to integrate the new scholarship on women into the curriculum with emphasis on the introductory survey courses in eight representative disciplines: Art, Biology, Business, Education, English, History, Psychology, and Sociology. Approximately 70 faculty met in workshops for five semesters to 1) read and discuss the new scholarship on women, 2) evaluate current syllabi and create new syllabi incorporating the new scholarship, and 3) teach the new syllabi in their classes. Workshop activity was supplemented by three conferences, on Integrating the New Scholarship on Women into the Curriculum, on Interdisciplinary Study, and on Pedagogy, and the project concluded with an Area Conference to disseminate its results to neighboring institutions. In addition to the new syllabi, other products of the project include a 140 page booklet, Resources for Curriculum Change, and six issues of a newsletter, RE-VISIONS, describing the processes and outcomes of the project.

Sara Coulter and Elaine Hedges, Women's Studies
Towson State University, Towson, MD 21204
(301) 321-2859, 2860, 2660

Resources for Curriculum Change
RE-VISIONS: six issues, Winter 1984-Fall 1986
ON OUR MINDS: current newsletter with reports on continuing project work and dissemination, published each semester beginning Fall 1987

Executive Summary

Project Title: Transforming the Curriculum: Integrating the Scholarship on Women

Grantee Organization: Women's Studies
Towson State University
Towson, MD 21204

Project Directors: Sara Coulter
Elaine Hedges
(301) 321-2859, 2860, 2660

The Towson State University Project (1983-1986) "Transforming the Curriculum: Integrating the Scholarhsip on Women," was intended to integrate the results of the new scholarship on women into the traditional curriculum, with emphasis on transforming the introductory survey courses in representative disciplines across the curriculum. Approximately 70 faculty participated in workshops in Art, Biology, Business, Education, English and Writing, History, Psychology, and Sociology, in which they read in the theory and content of the new scholarship, conducted individual research projects, evaluated their current syllabi, modified them to reflect the new scholarship, and taught the new syllabi for two semesters. Workshop activity was supplemented with outside consultants, and with three conferences, on Integrating Scholarship on Women into the Curriculum, on Interdisciplinary Study, and on Pedagogy. The project concluded with an Area Conference that introduced representatives of secondary and post-secondary education in the Baltimore-Washington area to the project's results.

The primary purpose of the project was to create change in the traditional and heavily male-oriented curriculum in higher education: to work towards a more gender-balanced curriculum by introducing the materials and perspectives on women that have been developed by feminist scholarship over the last fifteen to twenty years and to do so in the kind of institution most representative of American higher education--the medium selective, public, non-doctoral, co-educational university. While Women's Studies courses and programs were thriving across the nation, they were not significantly influencing the traditional curriculum. Curriculum integration projects, such as Towson's, have been conducted to help solve this problem. Towson's project established certain specific goals: 1) that curriculum change be systematic within the institution; 2) that curriculum integration work be led by experienced women's

studies faculty; and 3) that, in addition to the review and discussion of feminist scholarship, specific work on syllabi and the teaching of revised syllabi be included as part of the project.

Towson was an ideal setting for the curriculum integration project because the university has a well-developed women's studies program, a history of commitment to the education of women, faculty who are oriented to teaching and therefore to spending time on a project that would improve their teaching, and a student body composed of those who would benefit most from curriculum change--57% female, middle and working class, and racially mixed.

Even with these favorable conditions, careful preliminary planning was necessary to ensure adequate participation and support for the project. In addition to extensive consultation with administrators and department chairs, presentations were made at department meetings in each department selected for inclusion in the project, faculty were recruited individually, and two pilot workshops, funded by faculty development, were conducted for one semester to test our general design.

At the heart of the Towson project was the set of 11 workshops, extending over five semesters. Each workshop met for at least five two-hour sessions or the equivalent each smester, and each was coordinated by a facilitator chosen from the Towson Women's studies faculty for her teaching experience and knowledge of the new scholarship. Each workshop benefited from the services of two consultants who often also gave public lectures open to the campus community. The project was fortunate in being able to support the services of two Visiting Professors, one in American History and one in Biology, each of whom was in residence for one semester.

The three conferences were designed to reinforce and extend the activity of the workshops at crucial points in their progress. Early in the project a one-day conference provided faculty with an overview of the nature and meaning of curriculum transformation work and established a context for their own discipline-oriented study. Three outside speakers discussed the implications of the new scholarship on women for the humanities, the social sciences, and the sciences, while a fourth addressed the issue of women as students. Midway in the project a two-day Interdisciplinary Conference permitted faculty to assess their progress, to see how change in their discipline was reinforced by change in other disciplines, to explore gender issues common to all the disciplines, and to be introduced to the stage or phase theory of curriculum change--the stages faculty are likely to experience as they integrate material on women. Shortly after this conference, a one-day Pedagogy Conference explored the issues of classroom dynamics as they affect women students and the experience of

faculty as they introduced new material. This focus on pedagogy was continued in another one-day session in the last semester of the project. The project concluded with an Area Conference at which institutions of secondary and post-secondary education in the Baltimore-Washington area were introduced to the design and results of the Towson project. Workshop faculty led sessions on the changes they had made in their courses in specific disciplines for those attending. This conference established continuing contacts that have resulted in requests for materials, consultants, and workshops from these institutions.

The results of the project have been extensive and diverse, short term and long term. The immediate goal of the project--change in the syllabi of participating faculty--has been achieved. Some changes are small but promise to increase as the individuals become more comfortable with them. Some changes are extensive, resulting in completely new or transformed courses. Faculty have been activated to participate in conferences, present papers, lead workshops, and support relevant issues on departmental and university committees. Students are responding well to the new material and are beginning to take it for granted, often questioning instructors of courses that do not yet include material on women. The project has increased the real support of the institution for women's studies and women's programming. We have a half-time secretary, funding for a newsletter published each semester, and encouragement to pursue establishing a women's institute. Towson is increasingly being recognized as a leader in curriculum integration as evidenced by the large number of presentations we have given in the last two years and that continue to be scheduled. Our dissemination work with ten community colleges has resulted in a desire for further, more extensive work on their part. Five will support their faculty through released-time to participate in more extensive development if grant funding can be obtained.

The project provided several forms of evaluation: essays from faculty at the end of each semester of workshop activity, before and after syllabi, evaluations of each conference, a student attitude survey administered in selected courses, informal reports from faculty on student response to the new material and performance on tests and papers, and an outside evaluator who interviewed each member of the project and the project directors. In general, measurinig the impact of a project of this kind is difficult. Some results are short term and obvious, others, long term and elusive. We believe that change will continue to occur over many years at different rates in different individuals.

Body of the Report

Project Overview

The Towson State University Project (1983-1986), "Transforming the Curriculum: Integrating the Scholarship on Women," was intended to integrate the results of the new scholarship on women into the traditional curriculum, with emphasis on transforming the introductory survey courses in representative disciplines across the curriculum. Approximately 70 faculty participated in workshops in Art, Biology, Business, Education, English and Writing, History, Psychology, and Sociology, in which they read in the new scholarship, evaluated their current syllabi, modified them to reflect the new scholarship, and taught the new syllabi for two semesters. Workshop activity was supplemented with outside consultants, and with three conferences, on Integrating Scholarship on Women into the Curriculum, on Interdisciplinary Study, and on Pedagogy. The project concluded with an Area Conference that introduced representatives from approximately 45 institutions of secondary and post-secondary education to the project's results. In addition to the modified syllabi, the project produced a 140 page booklet and six issues of a newsletter describing its processes and its outcomes. The student audience served included the approximately 9,000 students who were exposed to the new syllabi for the two teaching semesters of the project, and larger numbers who have

been and will be exposed as the newly-modified courses continue to be taught.

Purpose

The primary purpose of the project was to create change in the traditional and heavily male-oriented curriculum in higher education: to work towards a more gender-balanced curriculum by introducing the materials and perspectives on women that have been developed by feminist scholarship over the last fifteen to twenty years. Initially, that scholarship was a response to the widespread and growing recognition, beginning in the late 1960s, that the experiences and perspectives of women were almost totally absent from the curriculum in higher education. Surveys revealed, for example, that history textbooks devoted less than one percent of their coverage to women; that literature courses contained on average only eight percent women authors; that the most widely used textbook in art history included not a single woman artist; that generalizations about "human" behavior in psychology were based on research 90 percent of which had been done on males; that in sociology the study of women was often confined to special units on the family or on minority groups; and that even scientific procedures were often less objective than is commonly believed, given the sex and class of the researchers.

The new scholarship that developed to correct such distortions and misrepresentations as the above initially led

to the creation of special courses in Women's Studies and to the emergence of Women's Studies as a new academic discipline. Women's Studies courses, and entire programs of study based on them, have flourished since the early 1970s. Currently there are over 30,000 such courses and 600 degree granting programs, and the published scholarship has been rightly described as a publishing "explosion."

The problem, however, which became apparent by the early 1980s, was that the bulk of the curriculum in higher education remained essentially unaffected and unchanged by this new scholarship. Women's Studies courses and traditional courses coexisted inside institutions of higher education, but ran in separate tracks and did not converge. Vast numbers of college students thus remained unexposed to the content and implications of the new scholarship. At a time when women comprise over half of the students in higher education, this became an increasingly serious problem.

Curriculum integration projects therefore began to emerge in the early to mid 1980s. Such projects were heavily concentrated in three types of institutions: large, public, research universities, private women's colleges, and private universities. No project had been designed to serve the most representative kind of institution in higher eduucation--that which teaches the largest number of American college students--the medium selective, public, non-doctoral

university. Towson is such a comprehensive, public university, and its project was intended to provide a model for that type of institution.

In addition, having examined the designs and outcomes of other curriculum integration projects, their achievements and their limitations, Towson's project established certain specific goals. The first of these was that curriculum change be systematic within the institution. The decision was therefore made to emphasize revision of a carefully selected and representative range of introductory survey courses across the curriculum. All students must take some of these courses, which provide the introductions to the various academic disciplines and usually give students their initial and crucial exposure to the meaning of the "liberal arts." 2) That curriculum integration work is best achieved when a strong, well-developed women's studies program is present, with an experienced faculty to initiate, guide, and sustain the curriculum integration work. Towson had such a program and such faculty, who were in charge of designing and conducting the faculty workshops that were the heart of the project. 3) That genuine curriculum change is most likely to occur when provisions for actual modification of syllabi, and for teaching those syllabi, are built into the project, rather than having a project merely or primarily focus on introducing faculty to the new scholarship. Hence the Towson project built into its

structure not only one but two semesters of classroom teaching, in order to provide faculty with time to apply, test, and further modify their new syllabi.

At the conclusion of the project we would still argue for the desirability of the above three conditions. What we have discovered, however (although we anticipated this), is that not even two to three semesters of reading in and exposure to the new scholarship is always sufficient to make faculty aware of the breadth, depth, and implications of the new scholarship on women and to motivate them to include it; that curricuulum modification or change is likely to be modest or tentative in some cases (although radical in others); that ways need to be found without infringing on academic freedom or seeming to dictate to faculty, of supervising the teaching of the new syllabi in order to evaluate the nature and amount of change; and that ways need to be found of generating in project faculty a sense of continuing responsibility both for curriculum revision and for disseminating the results of their work and experience to non-project faculty. Although our 70 faculty represented a large number, compared to other integration projects, it was far from covering all of the faculty who teach all of the sections of the introductory survey courses we had targeted. How to motivate project faculty to continue their own work and to help spread it to others in their departments after the conclusion of the project remains a problem. Future

projects might conider including a commitment that each discipline-oriented group of project faculty be responsibile for giving a formal report of its results to the faculty of its department.

Background and Origins

In many ways Towson was an ideal setting for the curriculum integration project we designed. Three factors were paramount. One: the university had a well-developed women's studies program and a history of commitment, including its origins as a normal school and a still extensive teacher training program, to the education of women. Two, since the school emphasizes teaching more than research, faculty were generally more receptive than they often are at research universities to the idea of spending time changing and improving their courses and their teaching. Third, as an urban public coeducational institution with a student body that is primarily working and middle class, racially mixed, including 13 percent minority students, and that is 57 percent female, both faculty and the administration felt a responsibility to recognize and respond to the need for changes in the curriculum that would reflect the composition of the student body. In addition, the Towson faculty, like that of so many institutions of higher education today, is a static faculty. Seventy-one percent are tenured, and the school is able to hire only a limited number of young instructors whose graduate school

training might include some of the new scholarship on women. Many faculty therefore recognized the need to "update" their knowledge.

On the other hand, because it is a teaching rather than a research oriented institution, Towson has a heavy teaching load--four courses or twelve hours a semester. In addition, many faculty teach evening and summer courses in order to supplement their modest salaries. They also assume a heavy amount of department and university committee work. With limited time for research and new reading, and with released time from teaching difficult to obtain despite somewhat improved efforts in this direction from a recently established faculty development office, faculty find it difficult to participate in a curriculum change project. Although we structured the time frame of the project as realistically as we could, spreading the work over five semesters, the many heavy and conflicting demands on faculty time must be taken into account in creating a project that will enable and encourage them to give to the work of the project the time it demands.

Even with the above favorable conditions--the interest of the faculty in teaching and the university's commitment to women--careful preliminary planning was necessary to ensure adequate participation and support for the project. The project directors and women's studies faculty researched other

curriculum integration projects and consulted with project directors and other experts in this field. They met with the president, provost, vice-presidents, and council of department chairs to explain the project and solicit support. Presentations were made at department meetings in each department selected for inclusion in the project. A folder containing information about the project, a reprint of a major review of the scholarship on women in that discipline, and a brief questionnaire, were provided in advance for each department member. Modest sums were provided by faculty development to conduct two pilot workshops for one semester to test our general design. We received commitments for becoming a priority in the selection of Visiting Scholars for three years, for the annual faculty conference for two years, and in allocation of departmental funds for travel and speakers. The university agreed to greatly reduce its indirect costs and to provide free room and board on campus for speakers and consultants.

Simultaneously, the women's studies office was gathering and distributing information on mainstreaming and the scholarship on women. This helped to stimulate interest and prepare for the more systematic work that the grant would provide.

The thoroughness of our preliminary planning was important in a number of ways: it eliminated conflict with departments

and department chairs insofar as the participation of their faculty was concerned and the later scheduling of these faculty to teach the courses that were being mainstreamed; it permitted us to begin immediately even in advance of the actual receipt of the funding (otherwise we would have started a semester behind schedule); it gave the project directors time to deal with the many unexpected problems that had not been anticipated.

Project Description

At the heart of the Towson project has been a set of 11 workshops, extending over five semesters. In these workshops, organized according to disciplines, selected groups of faculty have pursued a series of sequenced activities: they have read in the theory and content of the new scholarship on women, undertaken individual research projects (Appendix E), revised their syllabi, and tested the new syllabi through two consecutive semesters of classroom teaching. Eleven workshops have been conducted in: Art, American History, American Literature, English Literature, Composition, Business and Professional Writing, Education, Business, Psychology, Sociology, and Biology and Health Science. Each workshop has met for at least five two-hour sessions or the equivalent each semester, and each has been coordinated by a facilitator chosen from the Towson women's studies faculty for her teaching experience and knowledge of the new scholarship.

The workshops were organized by discipline or speciality within disciplines to facilitate faculty communication and enhance the focus on concrete changes in specific courses. The five semesters of workshop activity were designed to afford faculty maximum opportunity both to absorb and to apply the new scholarship. It was considered essential that theoretical perspectives be provided in terms of which the new research on women could be examined and understood, and so faculty spent a full year on the theory and content of the new scholarship. In some workshops it was more effective to alternate theory and content than to separate them into two separate semesters as had been originally planned. Including individual research projects in the plan enabled faculty to pursue the new scholarship in their own specialities, and to report on this to their peers; in many cases these projects had an additional benefit in that they led faculty to modify or "mainstream" their upper-level, specialized courses. Finally, in sustaining the workshops through two semesters of actual classroom teaching, the project tried to ensure that its ultimate goal--transmitting the new materials and perspectives to students--would be attained.

The first two semesters of reading and discussing the new theory and content were the most stimulating for the participants. Although the facilitators often felt that workshop members were not adequately comprehending the new

material, the essay evaluations and comments of the workshop members were consistently enthusiastic. The remaining three semesters of syllabus revision and teaching the revised course were less satisfactory and seemed to lose momentum. Analyzing a syllabus is comparatively dull and involves faculty in familiar struggles and rationalizations that they prefer to avoid as long as possible. They frequently felt trapped within the limitations of a departmental course description or textbook and were not, in most cases, aggressive or creative in thinking of changes. One helpful strategy was to ask workshop participants to brainstrom all the possible changes that could be made or patterns that could evolve from the most conservative to the most radical. They could then pick and choose from this range of possibilities what they wanted for their own course. Syllabi and ideas from other projects were helpful here.

While we believe that success depends on sufficient time to read, absorb, and apply the new material, our five semesters began to seem too long. Ways need to be found to maintain interest more effectively during the last three semesters. Partly in response to this problem, some workshops, in addition to syllabus revision and discussion of the classroom experience, continued coverage of more material, or invited colleagues, either from women's studies or from other workshops in the project, as guest speakers. For example, the English

Literature Workshop invited a women's studies faculty member from the history department to review the history of Christianity as it had affected women, and later a member of the philosophy department to discuss the work she was doing for her dissertation on feminist discourse. The Education Workshop invited a member of the Psychology Workshop to report on sex differences in recent cognitive theory and research which was his workshop project the preceding semester. Some workshops returned to the theoretical essays with which they had begun in the first semester, discovering that now they were understood as they had not been earlier.

To enrich and deepen faculty understanding of the new materials on women, outside consultants, outstanding scholars in their fields, were invited to campus to give public lectures and to meet with workshops in order to advise on curriculum modification: new course content, new perspectives, and workable strategies for effecting and institutionalizing change. Each workshop benefited from the services of at least two such consultants, and their public lectures, open to the entire faculty and student body, helped publicize the project, thus adding to its visibility on campus. We learned that it is important to distinguish between the consultant who is a leading scholar in research on women and the consultant who has experience integrating and teaching that research in courses.

Both are useful in different ways. Seldom can one person cover both. Locating the latter is more difficult than locating the former.

Furthermore, the project was fortunate in being able to support the services of two Visiting Professors, one in American History and one in Biology, each of whom was in residence for one semester. The Visiting Professors offered both lower and upper-level courses as models of curriculum reform, made formal presentations on the theory and practice of the new scholarship to their departments, to women's studies faculty, and to students, and served as consultants and advisors to FIPSE workshops in their disciplines. They added an important, additional dimension to the project.

Essential to the project were three major conferences (see Appendix), each designed to reinforce and extend the activity of the workshops at crucial points in their progress. In January 1984 a one-day conference provided faculty with the opportunity to gain an overview of the nature and meaning of curriculum transformation work and thus to establish a context for their own discipline-oriented study. Three outside guest speakers discussed the implications of the new scholarship on women for broad areas of the college curriculum--the humanities, the social sciences, and the sciences--while a fourth addressed the issue of women as students: how teachers teach and students learn in the classroom. The theme

connecting all of the presentations was the need to recognize the role that gender has played in the ways the academic disciplines define themselves, in the values they assert and the procedures they use; and the equal importance of gender issues in the classroom, as teachers try to facilitate learning for both male and female students.

The two-day Interdisciplinary Conference, held in January 1985, brought to campus five specialists in curriculum transformation work. At this point in the project, with faculty approximately half-way through, it was considered important to provide them with an opportunity to discuss their progress, to see how change in their discipline is being reinforced by change in other disciplines, and to help them further explore gender-related problems of content, theory, and methodology that are basic to all of the disciplines. In preparation for this conference, we asked workshop members to read during the preceding summer Dale Spender's Men's Studies Modified, which is a collection of essays critiquing the disciplines on their treatment of women. In September, they identified topics they would like to have addressed at the Interdisciplinary Conference in January. The Spender book was not as successful as we had anticipated, for faculty felt inadequate to evaluate a critique of someone's else's discipline and were sometimes alienated by the cumulative attack of these essays on the traditional disciplines. A

better approach, we now believe, would have been a collection of essays that would have given striking or memorable examples of conceptual problems, such as Joan Kelly-Gadol's "Did Women Have a Renaissance?" which quickly and clearly defines the problem of historical periodization based on men's, but not women's, lives. In spite of some problems in moving faculty beyond their own disciplines, it is important to do so, for information and insights from all of the disciplines must be pooled in order to begin to explain why and how extensively women have been left out of the curriculum and how the curriculum can be changed to include them.

The Interdisciplinary Conference began with a presentation on the phases of curriculum change--the stages faculty are likely to experience as they undertake curriculum modification. These stages are 1) a curriculum from which women are largely absent, 2) one to which a few "great" women have been added, 3) one in which women, having been "added," are seen as an anomaly, or a problem, since they don't fit into traditional categories and value systems, 4) a curriculum in which women are studied on their own terms, and these terms are seen to raise questions about traditional categories, assumptions, and values which therefore need to be modified to account for women's experiences, and 5) a transformed curriculum, in which men's and women's experiences are understood together, and in

which race, class, and gender are recognized as necessary categories of analysis.

It is in the fourth of these stages that faculty are likely to encounter what have been called the "invisible paradigms" underlying the academic disciplines--those epistemological and methodological assumptions that have led to the exclusion or devaluation of women's experience. The conference speakers therefore presented a series of panel discussions in which they identified and critiqued these invisible paradigms which include the belief in objectivity, dualistic thinking, the use of language to reflect gender ideology, and the use of male experience as the norm. During the two days of the Interdisciplinary Conference formal presentations by invited, outside speakers and small group workshops enabled project faculty to identify and explore the implications of these paradigms in the academic disciplines.

In March 1985, a one day Pedagogy Conference for all project faculty included a formal presentation by a guest speaker, a panel of faculty discussing their experience in the project, and a panel of students discussing their experience in the classroom. Resource materials included "The Classroom: A Chilly Climate for Women?" from the American Association of Colleges and a compilation of concerns and experiences of project faculty as they had begun to integrate material by and about women into their courses. Pedagogy continues to be of

great interest to faculty because it easily cuts across all disciplines, they have had little formal training in how to teach, and they care about their students' learning. Feminist pedagogy or information about how women are affected by the classroom situation is less well developed than the new content about women. It is, therefore, harder to provide materials and answers. Nevertheless, in response to faculty interest, we scheduled an extra one-day conference session in the last semester of the project at which Marilyn Schuster and Susan Van Dyne of Smith College gave presentations and led discussions that helped faculty analyze their teaching methods. Based on our experience, we believe that it is easier to change class content than classroom behavior but that both are necessary for a truly transformed curriculum.

The project concluded with an Area Conference for institutions of higher and secondary education in the Baltimore-Washington area. This one-day conference consisted of four morning formal presentations by the project co-directors, a faculty participant, and a student, followed by two sets of afternoon workshops led by project faculty organized according to academic disciplines. The conference was attended by approximately 150 representatives, faculty and administrators, from 45 institutions of secondary and post-secondary education, and all participants received materials describing the Towson project and curriculum

transformation issues, in addition to specialized materials in the afternoon workshops. The response to the conference was enthusiastic, and we are still receiving requests from those attending for further work with them.

Project Results

The results of the project have been extensive and diverse. They are briefly summarized below according to impact on faculty, students, the institution, and the region. The regional impact includes all dissemination work including the FIPSE funded dissemination project (1986-87) with ten community colleges in the Baltimore-Washington area. More detailed supporting evidence is provided in appendices.

FACULTY

1. Changes in courses taught by project faculty range from modest to extensive. Areas of change include incorporating more material by women, using gender as a category of analysis, in some cases total reorganization of the categories of a syllabus from a class and gender perspective, providing more research topics about women for student papers, and introducing new classroom procedures that are drawing upon feminist pedagogy. (See, for instance, in RESOURCES pp. 18-19 and pp. 83-85.)

2. New women's studies courses are being proposed and accepted by departments involved in the project. For example, two new courses in Art and two to three new courses in History.

3. As a result of the project, faculty are attending more conferences; many project faculty are presenting papers and writing articles on their work in the project.

4. About 20-25 faculty are actively engaged in the dissemination efforts with area institutions (see REGION below). Through having to act as workshop leaders and consultants to faculty at other institutions, they are reinforcing and extending their own learning.

5. Formal presentations to their colleagues of the results of the project have been given by the Education and Biology workshops. There will be a presentation to the English Department in the near future.

6. Aside from the specific activities enumerated above, there has been a general change in attitude. We see that faculty are taking feminist scholarship more seriously; that is, they are attending to publisher's notices, announcements of conferences and speakers on women rather than, as in the past, relegating such material to someone else "in that area." In addition, faculty have "given themselves permission" to question the traditions within their disciplines. We see this new attitude as leading to continuing change.

7. A number of project faculty have expressed a desire to continue the discussions begun in the workshops even though the project ended in May 86. We are currently making plans for such discussions.

STUDENTS

1. Student Attitude Survey (Appendix F) provides some information on students.

2. Project faculty report that students are responding well to the material on women, are writing better than usual papers or essay exams, are producing better than usual discussions, are asking good questions.

3. Students are more aware of whether a course does or does not include material on women and are more willing to question the instructor if women are absent or trivialized.

4. Both faculty and students are more comfortable with discussion of material by/about women and seem to expect it rather than finding it unusual. This is true for both men and women students. The assumptions in the classroom have changed.

5. In some instances, students are questioning the curriculum as a whole or in their major departments and requesting explanation, if not justification, of the rationale behind current course offerings. These questions and requests are coming even from departments outside the project, for example, Geography and Political Science, indicating that the project is having a broad impact.

6. In fall 86 the project instituted DIALOGUES, a faculty-student discussion series. A majority of the workshops in the project have held meetings with students to discuss issues of course content and pedagogy related to women. Many departments are continuing the DIALOGUES series. Some of the impact of the project on students cited in points 2, 3, and 4 above has been evident through and facilitated by the DIALOGUES. The DIALOGUES series has encouraged committed students to become more active, and the project has given them a student constituency to which to speak.

7. Students are publishing through the Women's Center a newsletter for the first time. This perhaps reflects a growing sense on their part that they have a right to speak or that they will be listened to now more than before.

INSTITUTION

1. The project has increased awareness of and respect for women's studies as an important and essential area of academic inquiry. Women's Studies is receiving more financial support and additional faculty.

2. Through the large number of project participants, a political constituency has been created throughout the university on the various decision making bodies in departments, in the colleges, and at the university level. In our institution, many important decisions are made by faculty committees.

3. The success of the project has increased the real support and commitment of the administration. Initially the administration contributed generously to overhead costs of the project. During the course of the project, its support was primarily verbal. At the conclusion of the project and especially given the success of the Area Conference, the administration has increased its material support. That is, we have secured a half-time secretary, some increased budget including funds to produce a newsletter, and priority for discretionary funds. We have also been encouraged to pursue plans for creating a women's institute at Towson.

4. There is more concern for hiring or keeping faculty who have specialized on women in their discipline. And plans are underway to begin to create a series of joint appointments between Women's Studies and various academic disciplines in order to increase the presence of Women's Studies perspectives and materials in the traditional departments.

5. We are exploring a course on feminist perspectives on the liberal arts, to be offered through the graduate school. We have not previously been involved in graduate courses.

REGION

Through our newsletter RE-VISIONS, published each semester of the project and distributed locally and nationally, and through our conferences, especially our Area Conference in April 86, and through our FIPSE dissemination project with community colleges, we have established a regional presence and expertise in the area of integrating the scholarship on women into the traditional curriculum. The impact of this includes the following:

1. We conducted dissemination work under a FIPSE grant for ten community colleges in the Baltimore-Washington area. This involved a general conference held in November 86 and numerous on-site conferences and/or workshops (Appendix H). In addition, we were invited to provide speakers and workshops for the annual, state-wide meeting of the Association of Faculty for the Advancement of Community College Teaching (AFACCT). As a result of that exposure, we have given a presentation at Frederick Community College and provided information to other community colleges not among the ten in the dissemination grant. As a result of the success of this dissemination work, selected community colleges want to pursue more systematic faculty development and have applied to FIPSE for funds to support that effort.

2. Our dissemination work with four-year colleges has included consultation, speeches, or workshops for Johns Hopkins University, University of Maryland Baltimore County, Gettysbury College, University of Baltimore, Goucher College, University of Richmond, Ohio University, and the College of Notre Dame (two year faculty development under an AAC Quill Grant). In addition to continuing work with some of these institutions, we presented sessions during the spring 1988 semester for Glassboro State College (N.J.) and Frostburg State College (Md.).

3. Our dissemination work with secondary schools has so far been primarily with private schools, but we intend to make further efforts to involve the public school system. We have worked with Mercy High School, Friends School, The Park School, St. Paul's School for Girls, and with AIMS, the association of independent schools. A member of the project also gave a presentation at a state-wide meeting of selected high school principals.

4. We have presented reports on the project at seven national conferences: Association of American Colleges, American Educational Research Association, National Association for Women Deans Administrators and Counselors, and National Women's Studies Association ('86 and '87), the Conference on College Composition and Communication, the National Association for Liberal and Integrative Studies, and the National Conference of the Association of Women in Psychology. We will be presenting workshops at the annual meeting of the American Association of Higher Education and the National Women's Studies Association spring and summer of 1988.

Evaluation

The project provided several forms of evaluation: essays from faculty at the end of each semester of workshop activity, before and after syllabi that could be analyzed for change, evaluations of each conference, a student attitude survey administered in selected courses, informal reports from faculty on student response to the new material and performance on tests and papers, and an outside evaluator who interviewed each member of the project and the project directors (Appendx G). In addition, we have been conducting individual interviews (in progress) with project participants one year after completion of the project. We participated in an evaluation of

mainstreaming projects conducted by Formative Evaluation Research of Ann Arbor for the Ford Foundation and have been informed that we have been selected by the Ford Foundation to participate in a more extensive on-site evaluation project they will be conducting in the near future.

We are eager to find evaluation procedures and instruments that tell us what is happening and permit us to determine what is most effective, but we are skeptical about the ability of current methods to identify important information. Much cooperative effort needs to be devoted to this issue. To that end we organized a collaborative presentation on the evaluation of integration projects at the American Educational Research Association in April 1987. We learned much that we wish we had known when we were creating our original proposal. Papers from the session are available from the individual presenters listed in Appendix H, Coulter Vita, AERA presentation.

The procedures used in our own project varied widely in effectiveness. The faculty essays were useful in the first two semesters but sometimes difficult to get faculty to write. We believe the on-going process of change is complex, individual, and important to capture. We would therefore recommend that, where essays are not provided by the faculty, individual interviews be conducted. Many faculty who will not respond to memos or write essays will be glad to talk on the phone or in person about their opinions and reactions. Time for such

conversation should be provided in the original planning.

It is important to collect examples of before and after syllabi, but they may not be as informative as anticipated and should be accompanied by discussion of what the faculty member sees as the changes or as the particular approach to women in the course. Syllabi also need to be supplemented with paper or exercise assignments and test questions since these are what many students use as an index to what the course is about. A change in content without a change in test questions convinces students that the changes are unimportant.

Evaluations of conferences can be informative and should be conducted, but they seem to have less influence on the planning of the next conference than might be supposed, probably because some things cannot be changed and the purpose of each conference is different.

The student attitude survey was an attempt to get some data on students. We chose an attitude survey over a content survey because we could not find a content survey that would be appropriate for the diversity of courses we were mainstreaming. We were not pleased with existing attitude survey instruments and tried to create one of our own. The survey was expensive, time consuming, irritated both faculty and students who had to fill it out, and did not yield useful information in proportion to the trouble it involved. Until better alternatives are available, we would not recommend this kind of evaluation.

The interviews of the outside evaluator, Dr. Sue Rosser (Appendix G), were very useful and a good method of evaluation. The questions were systematic and answers could therefore be compared. The faculty felt freer to indicate their dissatisfaction to an outside interviewer. The year-after interviews that we have been conducting are producing interesting results in the sense that there is a much wider variety of ways that faculty are implementing their new perspectives than we would have anticipated. We look forward to the Ford evaluation but retain some scepticism about the ability of current methods to measure such fundamental, long term change.

In general, measuring the impact of a project of this kind is difficult. There is considerable variety according to personality, discipline, and the politics of a particular department. In spite of much knowledge of and experience with the faculty in the project, the co-directors are still surprised by sudden leaps forward. Just when it seems as though no progress has been made, a new course will be created, a faculty member will move from passivity to active commitment, an opponent will cease opposing, a mind will have been changed. We have especially observed a number of specific positive developments, including the creation of new courses, additional mainstreaming of existing courses, attendance at conferences, new directions in research, etc., in individual faculty in the

semesters since Dr. Rosser conducted her exit interviews with them. There is an unpredictable quality to these developments that suggests the emotional struggle involved in this kind of fundamental change. We believe that change will continue to occur over many years at different rates in different individuals.

Summary and Conclusions

While we have included in the preceding discussion many of our insights and conclusions, we would emphasize here the slowness and complexity of this fundamental kind of change. Continuing opportunity and support for such curriculum change is essential if large numbers of faculty or institutions are to participate so that such educational change becomes widespread and thorough rather than scattered and superficial.

To this end we would underscore several prevalent needs. One, we need still to discover the kinds of support that are most effective at each stage in the process of changing faculty minds and curriculuum content. A comparative study of the procedures and strategies used in various curriculum transformation projects would be useful.

Two, we need to counteract the belief that such curriculum change can be simple and quick. In our consulting work we continually find that we need to deal with the belief of well meaning administrators that one day or one year of well

organized work will produce a transformed curriculum. Integrating gender, let alone race, class, ethnicity, and multi-cultural material, requires such a fuundamental reorientation of the disciplines and of faculty thinking and habits that it inevitably means long-term commitment of time and resources. Frequently this reorientation involves correcting misunderstandings about women's studies and feminism as well as about the complelxity of the issues involved in curriculum integration.

Three, because it is unlikely that such large-scale projects as Towson's and others that were conducted during the early and mid-1980s will be funded in the future, it is imperative that the results of such projects be made more systematically and conveniently available to the ever-increasing numbers of faculty and institutions interested in curriculum transformation and requesting assistance. There is by now a rich body of curriculum transformation material available, including descriptions of projects and the transformed syllabi that are their products. A resource center for the collection and distribution of such materials is urgently needed, so that faculty and institutions throughout the country would have efficient access to those materials best suited to their needs. We would encourage funding agencies to consider this a priority for the immediate future of curriculum transformation work.